
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

§

versus

§

CASE NO. 4:18-CR-81(3)

§

ALEXIS SIMONE MARCH

§

§

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pending before the court is Defendant Alexis Simone March's ("March") Motion to Reduce Sentence Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) (#161), wherein March seeks an order reducing her sentence to time served, or in the alternative, recommending home confinement for the duration of her sentence due to COVID-19. The Government filed a Response in opposition (#164). After conducting an investigation, United States Probation and Pretrial Services ("Probation") recommends that the court deny the motion. Having considered the pending motion, the submissions of the parties, Probation's recommendation, the record, and the applicable law, the court is of the opinion that the motion should be DENIED.

I. Background

On September 21, 2018, March pleaded guilty pursuant to a binding plea agreement to Count One of the Indictment charging her with Conspiracy to Commit Bank Robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. On May 2, 2019, the court sentenced March to 30 months' imprisonment, followed by 3 years of supervised release. The court also imposed criminal monetary penalties, including restitution in the amount of \$241,230.00. March is currently housed at Federal Medical Center Carswell, located in Fort Worth, Texas ("FMC Carswell"). Her projected release date is June 18, 2021.

II. Analysis

A. Compassionate Release

On December 21, 2018, the President signed the First Step Act of 2018 into law. *See* First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194. The Act, in part, amended 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c), which gives the court discretion, in certain circumstances, to reduce a defendant’s term of imprisonment:

The court, upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”), or upon motion of the defendant after the defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the [BOP] to bring a motion on the defendant’s behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant’s facility, whichever is earlier, may reduce the term of imprisonment (and may impose a term of probation or supervised release with or without conditions that does not exceed the unserved portion of the original term of imprisonment), after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if it finds that extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction; or the defendant is at least 70 years of age, has served at least 30 years in prison, pursuant to a sentence imposed under section 3559(c), for the offense or offenses for which the defendant is currently imprisoned, and a determination has been made by the Director of the [BOP] that the defendant is not a danger to the safety of any other person or the community, as provided under section 3142(g); and that such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission

18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). This provision is commonly referred to as “compassionate release.”

Prior to the First Step Act, only the Director of the BOP could file a motion seeking compassionate release. *See United States v. Franco*, No. 20-60473, 2020 WL 5249369, at *1 (5th Cir. Sept. 3, 2020) (“Prior to the passage of the First Step Act . . . courts lacked the power to adjudicate motions for compassionate release.”); *Tuozzo v. Shartle*, No. 13-4897, 2014 WL 806450, at *2 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2014) (denying petitioner’s motion for compassionate release because no motion for his release was filed by the BOP). The First Step Act amended § 3582(c) by providing a defendant the means to appeal the BOP’s decision not to file a motion for

compassionate release on the defendant's behalf. *United States v. Cantu*, 423 F. Supp. 3d 345, 347 (S.D. Tex. 2019); *United States v. Bell*, No. 3:93-CR-302-M, 2019 WL 1531859, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 9, 2019). The plain language of the statute, however, makes it clear that the court may not grant a defendant's motion for compassionate release unless the defendant has complied with the administrative exhaustion requirement. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A); *Franco*, 2020 WL 5249369, at *1 (holding that the statutory requirement that a defendant file a request with the BOP before filing a motion for compassionate release in federal court "is *not* jurisdictional but that it *is* mandatory"); *United States v. Alam*, 960 F.3d 831, 833 (6th Cir. 2020) ("Even though [the] exhaustion requirement does not implicate [the court's] subject-matter jurisdiction, it remains a mandatory condition."); *United States v. Raia*, 954 F.3d 594, 597 (3d Cir. 2020) ("[T]he exhaustion requirement . . . presents a glaring roadblock foreclosing compassionate release."). Thus, before seeking relief from the court, a defendant must first submit a request to the warden of her facility to move for compassionate release on her behalf and then either exhaust her administrative remedies or wait for the lapse of 30 days after the warden received the request. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A); *Franco*, 2020 WL 5249369, at *1 ("The text . . . outlines two routes a defendant's motion can follow to be properly before the court. Both routes begin with the defendant requesting that 'the [BOP]' 'bring a motion on the defendant's behalf.'"); *United States v. Harris*, 812 F. App'x 106, 107 (3d Cir. 2020); *United States v. Springer*, No. 20-5000, 2020 WL 3989451, at *3 (10th Cir. July 15, 2020) (defendant "was required to request that the BOP file a compassionate-release motion on his behalf to initiate his administrative remedies" (citing *Raia*, 954 F.3d at 595)); *Alam*, 960 F.3d at 833-34; *United States v. Soliz*, No. 2:16-190-3, 2020 WL 2500127, at *3 (S.D. Tex. May 14, 2020) ("§ 3582(c)(1)(A)

does not provide this Court with the equitable authority to excuse [defendant's] failure to exhaust his administrative remedies or to waive the 30-day waiting period.” (quoting *United States v. Reeves*, No. 18-00294, 2020 WL 1816496, at *2 (W.D. La. Apr. 9, 2020)).

In the motion, March's counsel states that he submitted a request to reduce March's sentence to the warden of the facility where is she housed on July 23, 2020. On August 18, 2020, according to counsel, the warden reportedly denied such request. From the record before the court, it is unclear whether the request was based on compassionate release due to COVID-19 or some other basis. Thus, March is foreclosed from obtaining relief because she has not demonstrated that she submitted a request for compassionate release based on the circumstances raised in the instant motion to the warden of the facility where she is housed. *See Franco*, 2020 WL 5249369, at *2 (“Congress has commanded that a ‘court *may not* modify a term of imprisonment’ if a defendant has not filed a request with the BOP.”); *Alam*, 960 F.3d at 832 (“[B]ecause this exhaustion requirement serves valuable purposes (there is no other way to ensure an orderly processing of applications for early release) and because it is mandatory (there is no exception for some compassionate-release requests over others), we must enforce it.”); *United States v. Garcia*, No. CR 2:18-1337, 2020 WL 3000528, at *3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020) (“While the Court sympathizes with Defendant's plight, because he has failed to comply with the exhaustion requirements under § 3582, his motion is not ripe for review, and the Court is without jurisdiction to grant it.”); *United States v. Garcia-Mora*, No. CR 18-00290-01, 2020 WL 2404912, at *2 (W.D. La. May 12, 2020) (“Section 3582(c)(1)(A) does not provide [the court] with the equitable authority to excuse [the defendant's] failure to exhaust his administrative remedies or to waive the 30-day waiting period.”); *United States v. Collins*, No. CR 04-50170-04,

2020 WL 1929844, at *2 (W.D. La. Apr. 20, 2020); *see also Ross v. Blake*, ___ U.S. ___, 136 S. Ct. 1850, 1857 (2016) (“[J]udge-made exhaustion doctrines . . . remain amenable to judge-made exceptions,” whereas “mandatory exhaustion statutes . . . establish mandatory exhaustion regimes, foreclosing judicial discretion.”). Moreover, even if March complied with the exhaustion requirement before filing the instant motion, nothing in her motion indicates that extraordinary and compelling reasons exist to modify her term of imprisonment.

Congress did not define “extraordinary and compelling.” Rather, it elected to delegate its authority to the United States Sentencing Commission (“the Commission”). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 994(t) (“The Commission, in promulgating general policy statements regarding the sentencing modification provisions in section 3582(c)(1)(A) of title 18, shall describe what should be considered extraordinary and compelling reasons for sentence reduction, including the criteria to be applied and a list of specific examples.”); *see also* U.S. SENTENCING GUIDELINES MANUAL § 1B1.13 (U.S. SENTENCING COMM’N 2018) (“USSG”). In Application Note 1 to § 1B1.13 of the USSG, the Commission defined “extraordinary and compelling reasons” to include the following four categories of circumstances: (i) certain medical conditions of the defendant; (ii) the defendant is 65 years or older and meets other requirements; (iii) the defendant’s family has specified needs for a caregiver; and (iv) other reasons in the defendant’s case that establish an extraordinary and compelling reason. The court must also consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a),¹ as applicable, and find that the sentence modification is consistent with the

¹ Section 3553(a) directs courts to consider: the nature and circumstances of the offense and the defendant’s history and characteristics; the need to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense; the need to deter criminal conduct; the need to protect the public; the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner; the kinds of sentences and sentencing ranges established for defendants with similar characteristics under applicable USSG provisions

policy statements issued by the Commission. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). The policy statement regarding compassionate release requires a determination that “the defendant is not a danger to the safety of any other person or to the community.” U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13(2).

As grounds for relief set forth in the motion, March contends, through counsel, that she “actually tested positive for COVID-19 and has to be symptomatic, very ill, suffered from weight loss, and is fearful that she may not see her daughters again.” The USSG provides that extraordinary and compelling reasons exist regarding a defendant’s medical condition when the defendant is “suffering from a terminal illness (*i.e.*, a serious and advanced illness with an end of life trajectory)” or when a defendant is “suffering from a serious physical or medical condition,” “suffering from a serious functional or cognitive impairment,” or “experiencing deteriorating physical or mental health because of the aging process, that substantially diminishes the ability of the defendant to provide self-care within the environment of a correctional facility and from which he or she is not expected to recover.” U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(A).

In the case at bar, March, age 26, attaches no medical records or other documentation in support of her health claims. A review of her Presentence Investigation Report (“PSR”), prepared in January 2019, reveals that when Probation inquired about her health, March stated that she was healthy, had no physical limitations or history of health problems, and had no prior hospitalizations. Probation now reports that records recently received from the BOP indicate that March has recovered from COVID-19. She is classified as a Care Level 1 inmate (less than 70 years old, generally healthy, and with limited medical needs). In her motion, March asserts that

and policy statements; any pertinent policy statement of the Commission in effect on the date of sentencing; the need to avoid unwarranted disparities among similar defendants; and the need to provide restitution to the victim. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

she delivered a child approximately one year ago, while in BOP custody, but she makes no mention of experiencing any complications from the birth. March's medical summary does not meet the criteria for compassionate release listed above. March has no medical condition that is terminal or substantially diminishes her ability to provide self-care. Hence, March has failed to establish that a qualifying medical condition exists that would constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons to reduce her sentence.

Although the USSG acknowledges that extraordinary and compelling reasons may exist with respect to a defendant's family circumstances, it specifies the following qualifying conditions: (i) "[t]he death or incapacitation of the caregiver of the defendant's minor child or minor children" or (ii) "[t]he incapacitation of the defendant's spouse or registered partner when the defendant would be the only available caregiver for the spouse or registered partner." U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(C)(i)-(ii). Here, March maintains that she has two daughters: a two-year old and a one-year old. Further, March contends that her younger daughter has been diagnosed with a heart condition for which she already underwent infant heart surgery and which requires frequent appointments with a cardiologist. March's PSR relates that March's mother, Cindy March ("Mrs. March"), assumed custody of her children while March went to prison. Probation contacted Mrs. March, who reported she is 50 years old and suffers from degenerative bone disease in her spine, a bulging disc in her neck, a compressed spine, and a torn rotator cuff that requires surgery. Probation reports that Mrs. March expressed that, although it is emotionally and financially difficult to raise March's children, she and her husband (March's father) are both employed, are able to provide food, shelter, and clothing for the children, and have been able to manage the situation. Therefore, March cannot claim she is the only available caregiver for her minor

children. Thus, March fails to meet the requirements for family circumstances that establish extraordinary and compelling reasons.

March's request for compassionate release potentially falls into the fourth, catch-all category of "other" extraordinary and compelling reasons, which specifically states that the Director of the BOP shall determine whether "there exists in the defendant's case an extraordinary and compelling reason other than, or in combination with, the reasons described in subdivisions (A) through (C)." U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(D). Although Subdivision D is reserved to the BOP Director, the Commission acknowledged, even before the passage of the First Step Act, that courts are in the position to determine whether extraordinary and compelling circumstances are present. *United States v. Beck*, 425 F. Supp. 3d 573, 583 (M.D.N.C. 2019) ("Read in light of the First Step Act, it is consistent with the previous policy statement and with the Commission guidance more generally for courts to exercise similar discretion as that previously reserved to the BOP Director in evaluating motions by defendants for compassionate release."); *see Cantu*, 423 F. Supp. 3d at 352 ("[T]he correct interpretation of § 3582(c)(1)(A) . . . is that when a defendant brings a motion for a sentence reduction under the amended provision, the Court can determine whether any extraordinary and compelling reasons other than those delineated in U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(A)-(C) warrant granting relief.").

In this case, there is no indication that the BOP Director made a determination regarding the presence of extraordinary and compelling reasons with respect to March for any reason. It is well settled that "compassionate release is discretionary, not mandatory." *United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020). In exercising its discretion, the court, likewise, finds that no extraordinary and compelling reasons exist in relation to March's situation.

March expresses concerns regarding the spread of COVID-19 among the prison population. Nevertheless, as of October 11, 2020, the figures available at www.bop.gov list 2 inmates (out of a total of 1,290) and 3 staff members at FMC Carswell as having confirmed positive cases of COVID-19, 522 inmates and 1 staff member who have recovered, and 6 inmates who have succumbed to the disease. Indeed, according to Probation, March tested positive for the disease, was monitored and treated, and has now recovered from the virus. Thus, it appears that the facility where March is housed is handling the outbreak appropriately and providing adequate medical care.

Although March expresses legitimate concerns regarding COVID-19, she does not establish that the BOP cannot manage the outbreak within her correctional facility or that the facility is specifically unable to treat March, if she were to contract the virus once again and develop COVID-19 symptoms, while incarcerated. *See Raia*, 954 F.3d at 597 (“[T]he mere existence of COVID-19 in society and the possibility that it may spread to a particular prison alone cannot independently justify compassionate release, especially considering BOP’s statutory role, and its extensive and professional efforts to curtail the virus’s spread.”); *United States v. Vasquez*, No. CR 2:18-1282-S-1, 2020 WL 3000709, at *3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020) (“General concerns about the spread of COVID-19 or the mere fear of contracting an illness in prison are insufficient grounds to establish the extraordinary and compelling reasons necessary to reduce a sentence.” (quoting *United States v. Koons*, No. 16-214-05, 2020 WL 1940570, at *5 (W.D. La. Apr. 21, 2020))); *United States v. Clark*, 451 F. Supp. 3d 651, 656 (M.D. La. 2020) (finding the defendant had failed to present extraordinary and compelling reasons to modify his prison sentence because he “does not meet any of the criteria set forth by the statute” and he “cites no authority for the

proposition that the fear of contracting a communicable disease warrants a sentence modification”). Furthermore, contracting the virus while incarcerated, even in conjunction with preexisting health conditions, is insufficient to establish exceptional and compelling circumstances warranting compassionate release. *See United States v. Jackson*, No. 3:16-CR-196-L-1, 2020 WL 4365633, at *2 (N.D. Tex. July 30, 2020) (finding that defendant had failed to present extraordinary and compelling reasons for compassionate release despite suffering from previous underlying health conditions and testing positive for COVID-19).

Courts have repeatedly denied COVID-19-based motions for compassionate release filed by inmates who have already contracted and recovered from the virus. *See, e.g., United States v. Stockman*, No. H-17-116-2, 2020 WL 5269756, at *3 (S.D. Tex. Aug. 26, 2020) (noting that when an inmate is infected and recovers from COVID-19, the courts have found the risks of infection or severe symptoms or effects because of underlying conditions change and diminish); *United States v. Baker*, No. CR 16-179, 2020 WL 4584195, at *4 (E.D. La. Aug. 10, 2020) (“Courts have denied COVID-19-based motions for compassionate release filed by inmates who have already contracted the virus.”); *United States v. Neal*, No. CR 11-28, 2020 WL 4334792, at *1 (E.D. La. July 28, 2020) (“Courts have repeatedly found that defendants who contract COVID-19 and recover are not among those who fall within the guidelines or demonstrate ‘extraordinary and compelling reasons,’ meriting a reduction in their sentence.”); *United States v. Gallegos*, No. 4:17-CR-568, 2020 WL 3403032, at *3 (S.D. Tex. June 19, 2020) (“Having already contracted and fully recovered from COVID-19, the Court cannot say that Defendant’s asthma ‘substantially diminishes [his] ability . . . to provide self-care within the environment of a correctional facility.’” (quoting U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13)). Here, March has failed to establish that

a qualifying medical condition or other reasons exist that would constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons to reduce her sentence and release her from confinement.

The court further finds that compassionate release is not warranted in light of the applicable factors set forth in § 3553(a). *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) (requiring courts to consider the § 3553(a) factors before granting compassionate release); *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693-94. The nature and circumstances of March's offense of conviction entails her participation in a conspiracy to commit armed bank robbery. March and three coconspirators planned and robbed a credit union of \$241,230.00 in United States currency at gunpoint. March served as the getaway driver for two of the codefendants. The robbery proceeds were subsequently distributed among them. After a codefendant alerted the group to the presence of bait money, March and two codefendants drove to a park and burned the marked bills. March gave her parents \$16,000.00 of the robbery proceeds, which she falsely claimed to be casino winnings. March has a prior conviction for theft of property and previously violated the conditions of her pretrial release by failing to attend and complete a drug treatment program as initially imposed. She has a history of poly-substance abuse, including the use of alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and Ecstasy. In view of the circumstances surrounding her offense of conviction, the court cannot conclude that March would not pose a danger to any other person or to the community, if released from prison at the time.

Moreover, the BOP has instituted a comprehensive management approach that includes screening, testing, appropriate treatment, prevention, education, and infection control measures in response to COVID-19. In response to a directive from the United States Attorney General in March 2020, the BOP immediately began reviewing all inmates who have COVID-19 risk factors, as described by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for the purpose of determining

which inmates are suitable for placement on home confinement. *See Collins*, 2020 WL 1929844, at *3. The BOP notes that inmates need not apply to be considered for home confinement, as this is being done automatically by case management staff. To date, the BOP has placed 7,822 inmates on home confinement. The March 2020 directive is limited to “eligible at-risk inmates who are non-violent and pose minimal likelihood of recidivism and who might be safer serving their sentences in home confinement rather than in BOP facilities.” *United States v. Castillo*, No. CR 2:13-852-1, 2020 WL 3000799, at *3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020). The BOP has the exclusive authority to determine where a prisoner is housed; thus, the court is without authority to order home confinement. 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b); *Ambriz v. United States*, No. 4:20-CV-568-P, 2020 WL 3066861, at *2 (N.D. Tex. June 5, 2020); *United States v. Miller*, No. 2:17-CR-015-D (02), 2020 WL 2514887, at *1 (N.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) (“[N]either the CARES Act nor the First Step Act authorizes the court to release an inmate to home confinement.”).

In his Memorandum to the BOP dated March 26, 2020, Attorney General Barr acknowledges that the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) has an obligation to protect both BOP personnel and inmates. He also notes that the DOJ has the responsibility of protecting the public, meaning that “we cannot take any risk of transferring inmates to home confinement that will contribute to the spread of COVID-19 or put the public at risk in other ways.” The Attorney General issued a subsequent Memorandum to the BOP on April 3, 2020, in which he emphasizes that police officers protecting the public face an increased risk from COVID-19 and cannot avoid exposure to the virus, with their numbers dwindling as officers who contract the virus become ill or die or need to recover or quarantine to avoid spreading the disease. Accordingly, he cautions:

The last thing our massively over-burdened police forces need right now is the indiscriminate release of thousands of prisoners onto the streets without any

verification that those prisoners will follow the laws when they are released, that they have a safe place to go where they will not be mingling with their old criminal associates, and that they will not return to their old ways as soon as they walk through the prison gates.


As the court noted in *United States v. Preston*, “[t]he best predictor of how [Defendant] will behave if he were to be released is how he behaved in the past, and his track record is a poor one.” No. 3:18-CR-307-K, 2020 WL 1819888, at *4 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 11, 2020) (quoting *United States v. Martin*, 447 F. Supp. 3d 399, 403 (D. Md. 2020)). Here, March’s track record is similarly a poor one.

In short, March has failed to satisfy her burden of showing the necessary circumstances to warrant relief under the statutory framework to which the court must adhere. *See United States v. Dodge*, No. 17-323-01, 2020 WL 3668765, at *5 (W.D. La. July 6, 2020) (stressing that “the rampant spread of the coronavirus and the conditions of confinement in jail, alone, are not sufficient grounds to justify a finding of extraordinary and compelling circumstances”); *Koons*, 2020 WL 1940570, at *4-5 (same). As the court observed in *Koons*, rejecting the notion that it has “carte blanche” authority to release whomever it chooses, “[t]he Court cannot release every prisoner at risk of contracting COVID-19 because the Court would then be obligated to release every prisoner.” *Dodge*, 2020 WL 3668765, at *6; *Koons*, 2020 WL 1940570, at *5.

III. Conclusion

Consistent with the foregoing analysis, March’s Motion to Reduce Sentence Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) (#161) is DENIED.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 13th day of October, 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Marcia A. Crone". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "M" and "C".

MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE